



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,425	10/07/2005	Nicola Murdoch Heron	101015-1P US	6673
44992 7590 12/11/2008 ASTRAZENECA R&D BOSTON 35 GATEHOUSE DRIVE WALTHAM, MA 02451-1215				
EXAMINER				
TRUONG, TAMTHOM NGO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/552,425

Applicant(s)

HERON ET AL.

Examiner

TAMTHOM N. TRUONG

Art Unit

1624

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 22 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 22, 24 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

NON-FINAL ACTION

The amendment of 9-10-08 has been fully considered. The amended claims 23 and 26 have overcome the previous rejection of 112/1st paragraph, and is now withdrawn. However, applicant's argument has not overcome the previous rejection of obviousness-type double patenting (ODP).

Claims 18-21 and 23 are cancelled.

Claims 1-17, 22 and 24-26 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1, 4-7, 12-16, 22, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

a. In the present instance, claims 1, 4-7, 12-16, 22 and 24-26 recite the broad recitation "prodrug", and the claim also recites "ester" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection

desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949).

b. Claim 24 recites the phrase of "converting a compound of formula (I) into another compound of the formula (I)", which is unclear as to which compound gets converted into which.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112/First Paragraph

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Scope of Enablement (for prodrugs, hydrates and solvates): Claims 1, 4-7, 12-16, 22 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making a "prodrug" of the claimed compounds. The specification does not

enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The following factors have been considered in the determination of an enabling disclosure:

- (1) The breadth of the claims;
- (2) The amount of direction or guidance presented;
- (3) The state of the prior art;
- (4) The relative skill of those in the art;
- (5) The predictability or unpredictability of the art;
- (6) The quantity of experimentation necessary;

[See *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int., 1986); also *In re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)].

The breadth of the claims: Claims 1, 4-7, 12-16, 22 and 24-26 recite a “prodrug” of compounds represented by the formula I. The term “prodrug” covers just about any ester, amide, phosphate, sulfate having an infinite combination of functional groups, rings, substituents, etc., and could drastically alter the structure of the parent compound. Thus, the scope of “prodrug” is unduly broad.

The amount of direction or guidance presented: Although the specification briefly defines what a “prodrug” is, it does not provide working examples to guide the skilled chemist to select a particular ester, amide, phosphate or sulfate for a particular site on the parent compound

in order to obtain a “prodrug”. Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient enablement for making a “prodrug” of the claimed compounds.

The state of the prior art: Although it is not unusual to expect a “prodrug” of a compound, the process for selecting a particular ester, amide, phosphate, sulfate, hydrate or solvate is not standard for all drugs. For the claimed compound, there is no reference teaching any possible prodrug. Thus, the state of the prior art does not support the broad scope of “prodrug”.

The relative skill of those in the art: Even with the advanced training, the skilled clinician would have to engage in extensive research to select a particular “prodrug” for each compound from the large Markush group of the formula I. Not only one has to determine an IC_{50} value, but also *in-vivo* activity to establish an LD_{50} , therapeutic index and active metabolites for each “prodrug”. Given a large Markush group of the three formulae, such a task would require a tremendous amount of effort, time and resource.

The predictability or unpredictability of the art & The quantity of experimentation necessary: The process of making a prodrug requires three criteria: (1) the “prodrug” must be biologically inactive; (2) the “prodrug” must be metabolized into the active drug at a physiologically meaningful concentration; (3) the active drug must still have the intended biological activity. Many prodrugs produce additional active metabolites (*in- vivo*) that do not have the same chemical structure of the intended drug. Thus, the process of making a prodrug is highly unpredictable due to many unknown *in-vivo* factors as well as uncertain numbers of active metabolites with potential adverse effects.

Thus, with such a limited teaching from the specification and the art, the skilled chemist would have to engage in undue experimentation to make the hundreds of thousands of compounds covered by “prodrug”, of compounds represented by the instant formula in claims 1, 4-7, 12-16, 22 and 24-26.

Double Patenting

The **nonstatutory double patenting** rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-17, 22, 24 and 26 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of copending Application No. **10/ 559,328**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant formula I is a position isomer of the

formula I of the copending application 10/ 559,328 since the two formulae only differs at the point of attachment on the *pyrazolyl* ring. That is, the pyrazolyl ring is attached at the 4-position in the instant case whereas it is attached at the 3-position in the copending case.

Compounds that are position isomers are not deemed patentably distinct absent evidence of superior, unexpected results. See **In re Crounse** 150 USPQ 554; **Ex parte Engelhardt** 208 USPQ 343 regarding position isomerism. There is ample legal precedent for the proposition that position isomers are prima facie obvious without a teaching to modify.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 25 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must refer to preceding claims in the alternative language. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim 25 has not been further treated on the merits.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAMTHOM N. TRUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-0676. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T and Th (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*/Tamthom N. Truong/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624*

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**

*Tamthom N. Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 1624*

12-3-08